

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: August 16, 2006

Division: Public Works

Bulk Item: Yes X No

Department: Facilities Maintenance

Staff Contact Person: Bob Stone

AGENDA ITEM WORDING: Approval to reject all bids and to re-advertise for sealed bids to repair the roof at the Monroe County Detention Facility on Stock Island due to Hurricane Wilma

ITEM BACKGROUND: Two bids for the Roof Repair at the Monroe County Detention Center were received and opened on July 13th. One bid was for \$39,875.00 which is in line with the estimated cost and the other bid was for \$153,400.00. The low bidder did not submit required documentation and the bid bond was insufficient. The second bidder's amount is three times the estimated cost of this work, therefore, the recommendation to reject all bids and re-advertise.

PREVIOUS RELEVANT BOCC ACTION: At the May 16, 2006 Board of County Commissioners meeting, approval was received to advertise for sealed bids to repair the roof at the Monroe County Detention Facility

CONTRACT/AGREEMENT CHANGES: N/A

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval as stated above

TOTAL COST: Approx. \$800 to advertise

BUDGETED: Yes X No

COST TO COUNTY: same

SOURCE OF FUNDS: ad valorem

REVENUE PRODUCING: Yes No X **AMOUNT PER MONTH** **Year**

APPROVED BY: County Atty. OMB/Purchasing Risk Management

DIVISION DIRECTOR APPROVAL: Dent Pierce

DOCUMENTATION: Included x Not Required

DISPOSITION: **AGENDA ITEM #**

MEMORANDUM

DATE: JULY 26, 2006

TO: DENT PIERCE, PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION DIRECTOR

FROM: BOB STONE, MIDDLE KEY OPERATIONS DIRECTOR

RE: AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY – ROOF REPAIR – MCDC

Hurricane Wilma damaged approximately five thousand square feet of roofing membrane at the Monroe County Detention Center. The damaged area is above Housing Unit Alpha of which houses the majority of lock-down inmates in the jail. A temporary roof was installed in November and has since been coated to extend its life.

In working with the roofing membrane Manufacture's representative, a scope of work and specification was developed. Proposals were then requested from Contractor's certified by the Manufacture. Only one proposal was received with the Contractor indicating that he could start the work two to three weeks after a notice to proceed. The other Contractor's that were approached either did not respond, were too busy to provide a proposal or it would be months before they would be able to start the work. A request was made April 21, 2006 for BOCC approval of an emergency purchase order to commence repairs but was deemed inappropriate; therefore, approval from the BOCC was requested and provided on May 16, 2006 to advertise for sealed bids for this repair.

A bid package was developed with the earliest bid opening date of July 13, 2006. Two bids were received and opened on that date. One from the low bidder, a local Contractor that had provided the earlier proposal and the other a Contractor from Maryland at three times the estimated cost. Unfortunately, the low bidder is considered non-responsive due to not submitting required Tabbed Sections Tab 1, Tab 2, Tab 3 or Tab 4 as noted under Section 1, Para. 10 of the Bid Documents. In addition, the low bidder submitted a cashier's check as his bid bond for \$200.00 when it should have been for \$1,993.75.

Even though this roof repair may be considered an emergency, after conferring with the County Attorney's Office and not being able truly to justify spending \$100,000.00 more than the County should, it is with regret to recommend rejection of the two bids and re-advertise.